EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

foon 222 Dockets

17 FEB 1993

1N REPLY REFER TO: 7330-7/1700A3

RECEIVED

Honorable Al McCandless House of Representatives 2422 Rayburn House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515 FEB 2 3 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Congressman McCandless:

This is in reply to your letter of February 3, 1993, in which you inquired on behalf of your constituent, Lloyd Barber, regarding the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Notice) in PR Docket No. 92-235, 57 FR 54034 (1992). This Notice proposes comprehensive changes to the Commission's Rules governing the private land mobile radio services operating in the frequency bands below 512 MHz.

Those rules have been in place for over 20 years. While they have been amended on numerous occasions since that time, they nonetheless embody regulatory concepts based on yesteryear's technology and, unless changed, will stifle the growth and development of private land mobile radio technology and services, which are used primarily by local governments, public safety entities, and businesses to enhance their productivity. The Commission issued the Notice, therefore, to solicit comment from all interested persons on a wide variety of proposals designed to increase channel capacity, to promote more efficient use of these channels, and to simplify the rules governing use of these channels.

The proposals in the <u>Notice</u> reflect to a large extent concepts and proposals submitted in the initial inquiry stages of this proceeding. None of the proposals set forth in the <u>Notice</u>, however, are engraved in stone. Indeed, the proposals represent our best judgment at this stage of the proceeding on steps that must be taken to improve the regulatory climate for users of the private land mobile radio spectrum below 512 MHz. To this end, some of the critical issues that must be resolved relate to channel spacing, the amount of time provided to users to convert to new technical standards, how the 300 to 500 percent increase in channel capacity should be licensed, how the rules should be written to provide users technical flexibility, and whether the current nineteen radio services should be consolidated and, if so, how. I have enclosed for your information a copy of that part of the <u>Notice</u> that describes the numerous proposals.

Mr. Barber is specifically concerned about the impact of these changes on radio control (R/C) hobby users. Enclosed is a discussion paper concerning our proposals for the 72-76 MHz band. In short, we expect there would be no adverse impact on R/C operations because of any proposal contained in the Notice.

No. of Copies rec'd_ List A B C D E We are, of course, sensitive to the concerns of both users of private land mobile radio spectrum and R/C hobbyists. We will, therefore, take into careful consideration all their comments. Your constituent's concerns will be fully evaluated when we develop final rules in this proceeding. As indicated in the Notice, we remain convinced that without significant regulatory change in radio operations in the bands below 512 MHz, the quality of communications in the private land mobile radio services will continue to deteriorate to the point of endangering public safety and the national economy.

We want to thank you for your interest in this proceeding. Comments on the proposals set forth in the <u>Notice</u> are due May 28, 1993, and Reply Comments are due July 14, 1993. We expect final rules to be issued in 1994. We urge your constituent to file formal comments on all aspects of the proposals.

Sincerely,

Ralph A. Haller

Chief, Private Radio Bureau

Enclosures:
Notice
Order
Discussion paper
Incoming correspondence

Congressional

DUE82-12-93

PLEASE MAKE 2 EXTRA COPIES OF INCOMING, ATTACHMENTS, AND REPLY FOR DOCKET FILE, ROOM 222.

CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING SYSTEM 02/05/93

LETTER REPORT

CONTROL NO. I	ATE RECEIVED	DATE OF CORRE	SP DATE DUE	DATE DUE OLA (857
9300415	02/05/93	02/03/92	02/18/93	
TITLE	MEMBERS	NAME	REPLY FOR	SIG OF
Congressman	Al Mc	Candless	ВС	
CONSTITUEN	IT'S NAME		SUBJECT	
Lloyd Barber	inq.	comments on Pi	R Docket 92-2	35
REF TO	REF TO	REF TO	RE	F TO
2-5-93				
2-5-93				۶
DATE	DATE	DA	re	DATE
02/05/93				
REMARKS: Res	pond to the a	ttention of Mil	ke Riith.	FEB 5

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. WASHINGTON, D.C. 19.93. F.C.C. OFC. IF CONLECSIONAL LIGISON 1919 M St. Mashington, D.C. 2.534 The attached communication is submitted for your consideration, and to ask that the request made therein be complied with, if possible.

If you will advise me of your action in this matter and have the letter returned to me with your reply, I will appreciate it.

REP. AL Mc CONSIESS

2422 KHOB

WASHINGSON, B.C. 20515

ATW: MINE

REASE CALL TO CONSIEM

RECEIPT OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE

THANKS! ATT PAIS CORRESPONDENCE

Very Truly yours, 2/4/93 12:00

at Mbandler M.C.



Michael J. Riith Legislative Correspondent

Al McCandless Member of Congress 37th District, California U. S. House of Representatives Washington, D. C. 20515 (202) 225-5330 COMMITTEES:

BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Tongress of the United States Mouse of Representatives Washington, DC 20515-0544

January 29, 1993

97,735

DISTRICT OFFICES:

73-710 FRED WARING DRIV SUITE 112 PALM DESERT, CA 92260

POST OFFICE BOX 14442 PALM DESERT, CA 82255 (619) 340-2900

22890 CACTUS AVENUE SUITE 185 MORENO VALLEY, CA 92553 (909) 858-1444

Mr. Lloyd Barber 2127 Rosemary Court Hemet, CA 92545

Dear Mr. Barber:

Thank you for your letter and comments concerning the frequency restructuring proposed by the Federal Communications Commission (NPRM PR Docket 92-235). It's good to hear from you.

In response to numerous inquiries on this issue, I have asked the FCC to look into this matter and report back to me.

As soon as I have received their reply, I will contact you.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

AL McCANDLESS
Member of Congress

AAM/mir

The Honorable Alfred A. McCandless 2422 Rayburn House Office Building Washington, DC, 20515

January 20, 1993

MJR

Subject: FCC NPRM PR Docket 92-235

JAN 1 ES

Dear Congressman McCandless:

I am writing to request your assistance in the rejection of the subject proposal presently before the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for adoption.

This proposal developed by the FCC Mobile Land Service is of great concern to me because the frequency restructuring proposed in NPRM PR Docket 92-235, inserts two new frequencies, for Mobile use, between the 10Khz frequency spacing currently assigned for modeling and commercial users. I am very opposed to this proposal.

Our radio-control frequencies are in the 72-76 MHz band. This band is primarily used for private land mobile dispatch operations. However, our radio-control frequencies in this band are far enough apart from the land mobile frequencies that we have been able to share the band without either use interfering with the other.

The addition of frequencies only 2.5 Khz away from the currently assigned frequencies will, if adopted, render the \$3500 of model radio equipment I own worthless! It has only been a few years, since the radio frequency spacing was deceased from 20Khz to 10Khz in this band area. This action necessitated I replace my radio equipment in order to continue my model flying without concern that my equipment would endanger others!

I am now retired, and no longer can afford the replacement cost of the radio equipment I presently own. For me, this proposal would bring to an end the hobby I have enjoyed for thirty years and render useless thousands of dollars worth of model aircraft.

The proposal, if adopted, would not allow the operation of radio controlled model aircraft without endangering the lives, and property of others; both nearby and far away! The models I fly are big, heavy, fast, and expensive. Knowing this, I take every precaution I can to operate them in a safe manner. To do otherwise could result in a tragic accident involving property, or worse people. There is no precaution I can take to prevent a accident caused by interference by a mobile radio, broadcasting perhaps miles away, on a frequency only 2.5Khz away from my radio!

It is for the above reasons that I recommend that the proposal in FCC, NPRM PR Docket 92-235 to add frequencies between the model and commercial frequencies not be adopted.

All Radio-Control enthusiast urgently need your help now because the FCC has a deadline of February 26, 1993 after which it may become more difficult to prevent these proposals from going into effect.

Sincerety,

2127 Rosemary Ct. Hemet, Ca., 92545